

Appl. No. 10/781370
Reply to Action dated 6/26/2006
Page 6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 10 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested. The specification has been amended to remove a word that was inadvertently left in the application upon filing. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are amended. Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are pending.

Claim objections

Claims 1 and 4 are objected to for informalities. In claim 1, the language "cylinder portion" has been deleted. The amendments to claim 4 address the objection raised by the Examiner.

35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 1 has been amended to better define the front frame.

Claim 2 has been canceled as the subject matter thereof is already present in claim 1.

Claim 4 has been amended to use language consistent with claim 1.

The claims are believed to be definite.

Prior art rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi (US 4,852,678).

In addition, claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Adachi et al. (US 6,695,089).

Yamaguchi does not disclose a motorcycle with a front frame with front and rear side joining portions each having an integral boss that projects inwardly from the second end portion of the front frame toward and into engagement with the cylinder block. As

Appl. No. 10/781370
Reply to Action dated 6/26/2006
Page 7

described in the application, this reduces the width of the engine and allows maintenance of a small bank angle (see page 7, lines 22-25).

In Yamaguchi, the front frame 21 is connected to the engine 17 via the through bores 31, 32 and mounting bolts 33 (column 5, lines 11-14; Figures 2-5). The front frame 21 does not include integral bosses that project inwardly from the front frame toward and into engagement with the cylinder block. Rather, as appears to be shown in Figure 4 of Yamaguchi, the width of the engine 17 appears to be increased near the through bores 31, 32 and the bolts 33 appear to extend into the increased width portions of the engine 17. Although describing different embodiments, this concept of increasing the width of the engine in Yamaguchi is discussed at column 7, lines 51-55; column 9, lines 47-48; and column 10, lines 46-47. However, the Yamaguchi approach increases the size and weight of the engine 17.

In addition, Yamaguchi does not disclose a front side joining portion being formed adjacent an upper portion of a front end of the cylinder block and a rear side joining portion formed adjacent an upper portion of a rear end of the cylinder block. The exact location of the cylinder block of the engine 17 is not explicitly clear from Yamaguchi. However, the bottom bore 32 and its associated bolt 33 appear to be quite distant from where the cylinder block of the engine 17 appears to be. Therefore, Yamaguchi does not disclose a front side joining portion formed adjacent an upper portion of a front end of the cylinder block.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Yamaguchi. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable therewith. Applicants do not concede the rejections to claims 4 and 5.

Appl. No. 10/781370
Reply to Action dated 6/26/2006
Page 8

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: August 10, 2006

By: Curtis B. Hamre
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/jal/lad